

REMARKS

Present Status of Application

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of this application. The Office Action, however, has tentatively rejected all claims 1-9. After this amendment, claims 1-9 remain pending in the application. For at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 1 has been tentatively rejected because “the target parameter vector” lacked antecedent basis. On a substantive basis, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Patrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,956,463). Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly unpatentable over Patrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,956,463).

In this submission, claim 1 is amended to provide “the target parameter vector” relevant antecedent basis. As well as, claim 1 is amended to recite the target parameter vector being Mel-Scale Cepstrum parameter vector obtained by a triangular bandpass filter, the sample parameter vectors being Mel-Scale Cepstrum parameter vectors obtained by the triangular bandpass filter, and comparing the target parameter vector with the sample parameter vectors to find a matching sample parameter vector similar to the target parameter vector using DTW (Dynamic Time Warping) or HMM (Hidden Markov Model) method. Claim 9 is amended to recite the target parameter vector being Mel-Scale Cepstrum parameter vector obtained by a triangular bandpass filter, the sample parameter vectors being Mel-Scale Cepstrum parameter vectors obtained by the triangular bandpass filter, and the steps of comparing the target parameter vector with a plurality of sample parameter vectors stored in a parameter database to obtain a matching sample parameter vector which is similar to the target parameter vector using DTW (Dynamic Time

Warping) or HMM (Hidden Markov Model) method. Support for these amendments can be found in at least pages 5-6 of the specification. Accordingly, the amendments add no new matter to the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks contained below.

Rejection to Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 1 was rejected to because “the target parameter vector” lacks antecedent basis. In this submission, claim 1 has been amended according to the suggestion of the Examiner. Applicant submits that the rejection to claim 1 is thereby overcome and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a)

Independent claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by Patrick. Both independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to clearly define over the teachings of the cited art. This rejection is moot in view of the amendments made to claims 1 and 5.

U.S. Patent 5,956,463 by Patrick et al., is directed to an audio monitoring system for assessing wildlife biodiversity (hereafter “Patrick”). Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to specify that a target parameter vector being Mel-Scale Cepstrum parameter vector obtained by a triangular bandpass filter, the sample parameter vectors being Mel-Scale Cepstrum parameter vectors obtained by the triangular bandpass filter, and comparing the target parameter vector with the sample parameter vectors to find a matching sample parameter vector similar to

the target parameter vector using DTW (Dynamic Time Warping) or HMM (Hidden Markov Model). Simply stated, Patrick does not teach or suggest such features or limitations. For at least this reason, independent claims 1 and 5 patently define over Patrick, and the rejection of those claims should be withdrawn.


For the reasons stated above, Patrick does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1 or 5 (as amended) of the present application. Therefore, claims 1 and 5 are allowable over the cited art. As claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend from claims 1 and 5, respectively, the rejections of those claims should be withdrawn as well.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500